DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 273 949 CS 209 840

AUTHOR Berkowitz, Dan
TITLE Television News Sources and News Channels: A Study in Agenda-Building.
PUB DATE Aug 86
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (69th, Norman, OK, August 3-6, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Journalism; *Mass Media Effects; *News Media; *Newspapers; *News Reporting; Public Opinion; *Television Research
IDENTIFIERS *Agenda Setting; *News Sources

ABSTRACT

Noting that media agenda-setting research has seldom examined how the initial media agenda develops, a study examined the connection between news sources and agenda setting by means of a content analysis of sources and channels appearing in network television news and local television news. The findings were compared to similar studies of newspapers. Results indicated that television relied more heavily on routine news sources than did the newspapers in earlier studies. A similar amount of reliance on officials as sources was found as well as a small percentage of women identified as news sources. The findings suggest that sources may play a large part in agenda setting and therefore affect the public's images of reality. (Tables of statistics and 28 footnotes are appended.) (SRT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED273949

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TELEVISION NEWS SOURCES AND NEWS CHANNELS: A STUDY IN AGENDA-BUILDING

by

Dan Berkowitz
Graduate Student
School of Journalism
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405

Ph. (812) 335-9247 (office)
(812) 334-7910 (home)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dan Berkowitz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented to the Radio-Television Journalism Division, Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication annual conference, Norman, Oklahoma, August 1986

CS 209840

TELEVISION NEWS SOURCES AND NEWS CHANNELS:

A STUDY IN AGENDA-BUILDING

ABSTRACT

Many studies have touched on the concept of agenda-building peripherally; few studies have addressed it directly. This study attempted to link one kind of peripheral study, the study of news sources, to agenda-building research.

A content analysis of sources and channels appearing in network television news and local television news was performed. A comparison was also made between this study's findings and the findings of similar studies related to newspapers, such as Sigal's Reporters and Officials. Television was found to rely more heavily on routine news channels than newspapers in earlier studies. A similar amount of reliance on officals as sources was found, as was a low level of women identified as news sources.

The findings suggest that sources may play a large part in the agenda-building process, although the interaction between journalists and sources was not tapped through this study. If, through other studies, sources' agendas are found to be largely reflected in television news, then the findings of this study would seem to indicate that particularly powerful sources play a potentially large role in the signification of the public's images of reality.

TELEVISION NEWS SOURCES AND CHANNELS

INTRODUCTION

The study of agenda setting has often centered on the relationship between the agenda set forth in the media and the agenda of the public.[1] This research has usually been concerned with verifying the existence of an agenda setting effect by the media. Less often, studies have examined how the media agenda develops. Weaver and Elliott describe this process as agenda building:[2]

> where the focus is on how the press interacts with other institutions in society to create issues of public concern. This agenda-building approach is more concerned with how issues originate, or how subjects of news coverage become issues, than with the media-audience relationship studied so often by agenda-setting researchers.

Weaver and Elliott studied agenda building by comparing the topics discussed at a small town's city council meetings with news reports of council meetings appearing in the local paper. Another way to examine agenda building is to examine the channels and sources from which published news stories seem to evolve. That was the approach of this study. This kind of research usually has been framed as the study of source diversity, of political power, or of journalistic practices. The best-known studies are by Gans and Sigal.[3] Cobb and Elder state that "agenda-building has been touched upon and dealt with peripherally by several major approaches in the study of politics; however, it has remained largely tangential to all of these studies."[4]

The present research was based on a study by Brown, Bybee, Weardon and Murdock that studied news sources and news channels appearing in the New York Times and the Washington Post, and in four North Carolina newspapers.[5] It was a replication of a study by Sigal in Reporters and Officials, with the added dimension of local newspapers.[6] While Brown et al. studied newspapers, the present research examined sources and news channels appearing in local and national television newscasts.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Three basic philosophies of journalists at work have emerged in the literature. A brief discussion of these three philosophies will help put the study of news sources in better perspective. The first philosophy pictures journalists as mediators of news, basing decisions on professional values. Gans summarizes this position:[7]

> I view news as information which is transmitted from sources to audiences, with journalists--who are both employees of bureaucratic commercial organizations and members of a profession--summarizing, refining, and altering what becomes available to them from sources

in order to make the information suitable for their audiences.

Critical approach researchers present a different view of journalists at work, claiming that journalists are subservient to the dominant ideology. Curran, Gurevitch and Woollacott explain that:[8]

> Control of the production process by media professionals is confined, in this view, to the production of messages whose meanings are primarily determined elsewhere within the dominant culture.

A third outlook also sees journalists as too constrained to make professional decisions, but these constraints come from organizational needs, rather than dominant ideology. Epstein's News From Nowhere is representative of this perspective:[9]

> This version of the news is not the product of a group of willful or biased or political men, but of an organization striving to meet the requisites needed to survive in a competitive world.

These organizational constraints, Epstein explains, evolve from the economic, legal and social considerations of producing national network news.

The literature concerning sources also sheds light on the agenda-building process. Several studies depict sources as savvy officials who dominate the agenda-building process by conforming their information to the media's needs. For example, Sigal suggests that officials "have long grown accustomed to timing their press statements with an eye toward exploiting newsmen's deadlines," planning press sessions to gain maximum press coverage.[10]

Gans develops this idea further, explaining how sources gain access to journalists by developing characteristics favorable to the news gathering process. He divides source attributes into two categories: availability and suitability.[11]

A brief discussion of two studies helps put source power into perspective. Stocking examined the news coverage of American medical schools and found media visibility to be independent of public relations efforts to gain coverage, instead depending on source prestige, as measured by the institutions' size and research productivity. It is important to note that the news in Stocking's study generally came in the form of news releases.[12]

News in the form of a news event presents a different situation. Dunwoody studied science writers at a national science convention and found that television journalists might be more dependent on routine channels than newspaper reporters, because television reporters have more equipment constraints and therefore are less able to react to unpredictable news channels.[13]

In his analysis of news channels and sources appearing in the New York Times and Washington Post, Sigal developed two hypotheses:[14]

1. Most national and foreign news in The New York Times and The Washington Post comes to reporters through routine channels.

2. Most nonlocal news, regardless of subject matter, comes from officials and agencies of the U.S. government.

Sigal performed his analysis by examining stories from the front page of the two papers from 1949, 1954, 1959, 1964 and 1969. From a total of 2,850 channels and sources, 58.2% were from routine channels, while 25.8% came from enterprise channels. From Sigal's findings, then, sources, through routine channels, are shown to play a large part in the agenda-building process.

Looking at sources, Sigal found that 81.3% of all sources appearing on the front page of the two newspapers studied were officials in some capacity. Based on his findings, Sigal suggests that by adhering to routine channels of newsgathering, journalists leave news selection decisions up to news sources, with most of those sources being officials.

Brown, Bybee, Weardon and Murdock examined a total of 846 front-page news stories were coded, with 5,248 news sources counted. They discovered that front page national (56%) and wire (64%) stories "depended very heavily" upon routine channels, although the term "very heavily" here appears to be somewhat subjective. In any case, the 56 to 64 percent range suggests at least some degree of give and take between journalists and sources, approaching a situation of "mediated news."[15] Brown et al. point out, however, that enterprise stories comprised a smaller percentage of national (26%) and wire (11%) stories.

In local news stories, enterprise channels (41%) slightly outnumbered routine channels (39%). Summarizing this finding, Brown et al. state: "Thus we find yet another example of local stories performing "better" according to ideal pluralistic expectations."[16] In terms of the agenda-building framework, local news stories could be called "mediated news."

The study by Brown et al. covers one final area: identification of sources in news stories. The importance of source identification is, according to Brown et al.:

> Identification facilitates social mobilization. It allows readers to know who, specifically, agrees or disagrees with them on any given issue. This, in turn, may permit easier formation of interest groups for the purpose of shaping the formal agenda.

More information concerning the findings of Brown et al. will be presented in comparative tables in the results section of this paper.

PROBLEMS AND HYPOTHESES

This study addressed four research problems:

1. What kind of sources (for example: government, business or private special interest groups) are most likely to participate in the agenda-building process in television news?

2. How much of television news originates from routine channels such as news releases and press conferences and how much of television news is initiated by journalists?

3. What are the differences between local and network television news regarding news sources and news channels?

4. What are the differences between television news findings of this study and the findings of previous studies which examined the same kind of relationships in local and national newspapers?

Five hypotheses were tested:

1. Television news will use more government officials as news sources than other kinds of news sources.

2. Television news will have more stories originating through routine channels (press conferences, press releases, official proceedings) than through informal (leaks, briefings) or enterprise channels.

3. Both local and network television news will use more executives as sources than people identifiable as either spokespersons or workers.

4. Network television will use more news originating from routine channels than will local television news.

5. Television news will use a higher proportion of routine-channel stories than will newspapers studied by Brown et al.

METHOD

This section presents a discussion of sample selection and coding. The methods used in this study closely followed those used by Brown et al.

The sample consisted of a six hours of television newscasts: three-and-a-half hours from local newscasts and two-and-a-half hours from network newscasts. Five stations carrying both local and network newscasts were available by cable from which to sample. Each carried a local newscast at 6:00 p.m., followed by a network newscast. Three stations broadcast from

Indianapolis, Indiana (market size 23) and two from Terre Haute, Indiana (market size 123).

The sampling method randomly selected which day of the week each of the five available television stations would be sampled. However, the week chosen for data collection was selected purposively, based on time available to conduct the research. Stempel points out that studying television news content differs between weekdays and weekends.[17] Therefore, the choice of a five-day sampling week can be justified.

Stories were coded in the following categories:

Conflict/Non-Conflict: Stories were coded into one of these two categories from the definition used by Brown et al.: "A process of interaction among social roles, based upon disparities in views or positions about ends, means or ends-means relationships."

Topic: A total of 17 topics were coded, including military, politics, the government, crime/disaster/accident, labor and unions, economics, business, public moral problems (i.e. abortion, drugs), health, welfare, education, arts, science and inventions, energy/environment, religion, and miscellaneous.[18]

Channel: The primary channel of information was coded as routine (official proceedings, press releases, press conferences), informal (background briefings, leaks, non-governmental proceedings) or enterprise (interviews, spontaneous events, independent research).

Sources were coded in the following categories, as outlined in the study by Brown et al.:

Affiliation: Sources were coded into 25 sub-categories, falling into eight main categories. The eight categories included U.S. Government, State Government, Local Government, Foreign Government, Affiliated U.S. Citizen, Unaffiliated U.S. Citizen, Foreign Citizen, and Other.

Organizational Status: Each source was coded by position in an organization. Categories included executive, spokesperson, worker, position not specified (but general institutional affiliation mentioned), and other (used for veiled or unaffiliated sources).

Sex: Sources were coded as male or female when it could be determined from the story. Otherwise they were coded as unidentified.

Identification: Sources were coded as veiled or unveiled (the source's name was included in the story, or there was sufficient information about the source to allow identification).

All material was coded by the author. An additional coder assisted in intercoder reliability checks.[19]

FINDINGS

A total of 156 news items were analyzed, 76 from local newscasts and 80 from network newscasts. Three-hundred-and-seventy-six news sources were coded, 142 from local newscasts and 234 from network newscasts. The average number of sources in a local news story was 1.87, and for a network story, 2.93. The median and modal number of sources for either local or network news stories was one.

Intercoder reliability tests by a second coder averaged 93 percent agreement over the seven coding categories. The individual item reliability percentages ranged from a low of 90 percent to a high of 100 percent.

Hypothesis 1 predicted that television news would have more government officials as news sources than other kinds of sources. Tables 1 and 2 show that 49.3% of local news sources and 48.6% of network news sources were affiliated with government (including U.S., state, local or foreign government). In comparison, Brown et al. found that 48.4% of local newspaper sources and 54.7% of national newspaper sources were somehow affiliated with government. These proportions suggest that television and newspapers do not differ meaningfully in their reliance on government sources for news information.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that television news would have more stories originating through routine news channels than through informal or enterprise channels. Table 3 shows that 75% of local television news stories and 71% of network news stories appeared to have developed through routine news channels. In contrast, Brown et al. found local newspapers had 39% routine news channels and national newspapers had 56% routine news. These findings support Dunwoody's belief that the more constrained (for example: equipment, personnel, logistics of newsgathering) a news organization becomes, the more it will rely on routine news channels. In this case, television news, with much larger technical, personnel and time constraints was found to rely much more on routine news channels than did the less-constrained newspaper reporters of Brown et al. In addition to lending support to Hypothesis 2, the findings also supported Hypothesis 5, that television news would use more routine news than newspapers.

A third hypothesis related to routine news, Hypothesis 4, proved unfounded. It stated that network news would contain more routine stories than would local news. Findings in Table 3 show that no meaningful difference between network and local news could be determined through the data. This hypothesis was based on the finding of Brown et al. that local newspaper stories presented a significantly lower proportion of routine news than did

national newspaper stories.

Hypothesis 3 stated that television news would use more executives as sources than people identifiable as spokespersons or workers. Findings presented in Table 4 support this hypothesis. Interestingly, of those sources somehow affiliated with an organization, 26.2% were not identifiable as to their position within their organization.

Table 5 presents an abridged analysis of news story content by topic. Categories were selected on the basis of those with higher cell counts, excluding topics that had few stories for both categories. The table shows that network news presented a much larger amount of news about politics than did the local newscasts. In contrast, local news presented much more news concerning government. Crime news was also higher for local newscasts than for network newscasts.

In Table 6, network news was shown to include a higher proportion of conflict-based stories than did local news.

Table 7 presents a finding consistent with the study by Brown et al. Women were found to comprise only 5.6% of network news sources and only 11.3% of local news sources. Overall, 7.7% of sources were identifiable as female. It should also be noted that 42.3% of local news sources and 38.5% of network news sources were not identifiable by gender. Including only sources identifiable as male or female, 9% of network sources were female and 20% of local sources were female.

There was no meaningful difference found between the number of veiled sources in network and local newscasts. Table 8 presents those findings.

The following discussion compares findings for television and newspapers. This study found that television news stories, both local and national, averaged fewer sources per story than did newspapers studied by Brown et al. The maximum number of sources per story used in television news was also found to be lower than newspapers. The results are presented are presented in Table 9.

Local television news tended to use a greater proportion of veiled (or unidentified) sources than did local newspapers. However, network news and national newspapers both used a similar (and higher) proportion of veiled sources. This information is presented in Table 8.

The proportion of source affiliations for television and newspapers did not appear to differ meaningfully, although local television news used more sources that were not affiliated with an organization within the story context. (See Tables 1 and 2)

Two qualitative findings surfaced during data collection. The first

finding was that television news often presented large amounts of information without attribution during reports by correspondents, field reporters and news anchors. Although these journalists were not coded as sources, they could be possibly seen as such.

A second qualitative finding was that television news often cited officials, experts and analysts without clearly identifying the sources' organizational affiliation. For example, sometimes a source tagged as "expert" could not be identified as being affiliated with a special interest group or with a university. The impact of this finding bears directly on the ability of a viewer to determine possible bias in a source's information.

A conclusion of these qualitative findings is that television news content might not be completely comparable with newspapers because television journalists' trade practices seem to depart from the stricter attribution policies of newspaper journalists. For example, this study required coding decisions to be based on a larger amount of intuition of the newsgathering process than had been expected. Research concerning the reason for television journalists' less stringent efforts toward information attribution is recommended.

DISCUSSION

The most interesting finding of this study was the especially high reliance on routine news by television journalists, as well a large reliance on experts and officials. Television news was found to rely on a larger proportion of routine news channels than had been found for newspapers in previous studies.

These findings support the information presented by Dunwoody in her study of science writers as well as the findings of Edward J. Epstein in News From Nowhere. As was stated earlier, Epstein's thesis was that television news is largely bound in organizational constraints that are best accommodated by routine news gathering practices. Similar findings were presented by Gans, in Deciding What's News. One problem of this high reliance on routine news channels by television news is that those sources who best understand the needs of the television newsmaking process, as Gans pointed out, will stand the best chance of guiding the course of the news agenda. This is not to say that reporters will present the information from these savvy sources intact. For example, Altheide writes that "news procedures significantly alter what is said during an interview, and what is subsequently presented as the story."[20]

Altheide discusses news sources in qualitative terms that support the findings of this study. He suggests that "often as much as 70%" of network news comes from wire services. He further suggests that "half or more" of local stories derive from press releases and public relations announcements. The remainder of local news items are taken from police or fire department

radio monitors.

Drew studied three television reporters in a medium-sized Midwestern market and found a similar situation.[21] Of 34 news items, 27 evolved from routine channels (79%). In summary, Drew states: "Instead of digging, the reporters spent most of their time covering scheduled events, and news was represented by a sound on film interview with city officials."

Critical approach researchers would likely point to the connection between agenda building and the concept of ideology. For example, Hall writes:[22]

> . . . the more one accepts that how people act will depend in part on how the situations in which they act are defined, . . . then, the more important, socially and politically, becomes the process by means of which certain events get recurrently signified in particular ways.

Hall suggests, then, that the outcome of the agenda-building process may do more than make people think about specific topics or issues. Signification and situational definitions may be another less obvious outcome. This is not to suggest that the media have magic bullet-like effects, or that a pure state of hegemony develops through television's reliance on routine, source-originated news. T.J. Jackson Lears helps clarify the discussion. The process, Lears explains:[23]

> . . . depends not on the brainwashing of 'the masses' but on the tendency of public discourse to make some forms of experience readily available to consciousness while ignoring or suppressing others.

Hall again adds to the discussion, cautioning against an analysis of this signification process in terms of conspiratorial hegemony. He explains that the process of signification cannot be derived through simple reductionism:[24]

> . . . ideology can no longer be seen as a dependent variable, a mere reflection of a pre-given reality in the mind. Nor are its outcomes predictable by derivation from some simple determinist logic. They depend on the balance of forces in a particular historical conjecture: on the politics of signification.

To explain further, Hall might be seen as suggesting that the presence of a large body of routine news cannot be reduced to mean that the intentions of the sources will be reflected directly by the newsmaking process. Furthermore, content analysis alone cannot fully explain the outcome of the agenda-building process, a point which will be discussed shortly. In the agenda-building process, neither the sources nor the journalists can be considered to control the outcome, although a reliance on routine news does

suggest that the sources will play a greater role.

Blumler and Gurevitch present the media as a mediator of forces engaged in a struggle for power.[25] They suggest the power of situation definition by the media is largely an unconscious effort, a construction of ideology that evolves from media workers' selection and highlighting of information. Blumler and Gurevitch suggest that the creation of cultural hegemony is:

> . . . consequently at least partially 'hidden' from the audience and may even be 'hidden' from professionals involved in news production themselves, who prefer to think of themselves as passing news events on to the audience instead of shaping them up through the application of value judgments and constructed frameworks of perception.

This study, as well as earlier studies on newspapers, found a high reliance not only on routine news, but on coverage of routine news originated by officials. Discussing criticisms of journalists that arose in the 1960s, Michael Schudson writes:[26]

> . . . journalists were "political" unwittingly or even unwillingly. Their political impact lay not in what they openly advocated but in the unexamined assumptions on which they based their professional practice . . . The slant of journalism lay not in explicit bias but in the social structure of news gathering which reinforced official viewpoints of social reality.

In summary, the results of this study seem to suggest the possibility that officials and executives may dominate the agenda-building process in television news, as indicated by the predominance of routine news in both local and network television. The outcome of the agenda-building process should not be viewed, however, within the framework of conspiracy and social control. Instead, the focus should be directed toward examining the relationships between journalists and news sources, as well as examining the newsgathering process of journalists. For this kind of examination, content analysis alone is not the answer. Only the outcome of power relationships in society can be observed through content analysis. This concern is carefully pointed out by Brown et al.:[27]

> To some extent, by the time an issue reaches the public, by the time certain sources have been selected and others ignored, the key decision making has already been exercised. Content analysis probably is not the best means of getting at this dynamic. While the method does give us some indication of the status quo, it can not document how these issues came to be included on the agenda.

The findings of this study, then, can serve as an indicator in gaining understanding of the agenda-building process. As an indicator, however, it

may be inferred that sources play a large part in building the television news agenda, and ultimately, in shaping information from which people unconsciously build their images of the world. An understanding of the actual agenda-building process can be gained through the use of a variety of research techniques, such as observational studies of journalists, and surveys of sources that help establish their intentions and concerns in disseminating news information. In those research directions lies the call of future agenda-building research efforts. Weaver makes this call clearer:[28]

> Somehow, there needs to be some attempt to ascertain what the agendas of sources are and a companion attempt to determine media agendas, followed by a comparison of the two. . . The systematic analysis of source and media agendas (and how highly correlated they are) is necessary for trying to determine how much influence on news both sources and journalists have.

ENDNOTES

[1]For example, Maxwell E. McCombs and Donald L. Shaw, "The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass Media," Public Opinion Quarterly 36 (Summer 1972): 176-87, and David H. Weaver, Doris A. Graber, Maxwell E. McCombs and Chaim H. Eyal, Media Agenda-Setting in a Presidential Election (New York: Prager Publishers, 1981).

[2]David Weaver and Swanzy Nimley Elliott, "Who Sets the Agenda for the Media? A Study of Local Agenda-Building," Journalism Quarterly, 62 (Spring 1985), p. 88.

[3]Herbert J. Gans, Deciding What's News: A Study of CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, Newsweek and Time (New York: Vintage Books, 1980). Leon V. Sigal, Reporters and Officials: The Organization and Politics of Newsmaking (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Co., 1973)

[4]Roger W. Cobb and Charles D. Elder, Participation in American Politics: The Dynamics of Agenda-Building (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1972), p. vii.

[5]Jane Delano Brown, Carl R. Bybee, Stanley T. Weardon and Dulcie Murdock, "Invisible Power: Newspaper News Sources and the Limits of Diversity," paper presented to the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC), July 1982.

[6]Sigal.

[7]Herbert J. Gans, Deciding What's News (New York: Vintage Books, 1979) p. 80.

[8]James Curran, Michael Gurevitch and Janet Woollacott, "The Study of the Media: Theoretical Approaches," in Culture, Society and the Media eds. Michael Gurevitch, Tony Bennett, James Curran and Janet Woollacott (New York: Methuen, Inc., 1982) pp. 11-29.

[9]Edward Jay Epstein, News From Nowhere (New York: Random House, 1973).

[10]Sigal, p. 102.

[11]Gans, pp. 116-145.

[12]S. Holly Stocking, "Effect of Public Relations Efforts on Media Visibility of Organizations," Journalism Quarterly, vol. 62, no. 2 (Summer 1985), pp. 358-366+.

[13]Sharon Dunwoody, "Science Writers at Work," Research Report No. 7,

Center for New Communications, Indiana University, 1978. In the present study, "routine channel" is defined as news coming from official proceedings, press releases or press conferences.

[14]Sigal, p. 119.

[15]Brown et al., p. 11.

[16]Mediated news can be defined as news resulting from the interaction between journalists and sources. Alternatives could be journalist-dominated news or source-dominated news.

[17]Guido H. Stempel III, "Content Analysis," in Research Methods in Mass Communication, eds. Guido H. Stempel III and Bruce H. Westley (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1981), p. 125.

[18]The distinction between "government" and "politics" needs to be clarified. Stories coded as government were those related to activities of governmental bodies and individual legislators. Stories coded as politics were generally about conflict between governmental bodies or legislators, especially international conflict. No election-related stories were coded in this study, but they would have been included in the "politics" category.

[19]The author wishes to thank Philip Gaunt and LeAnne Daniels, doctoral students at Indiana University, for their help with the intercoder reliability checks.

[20]David L. Altheide, Creating Reality: How TV News Distorts Events (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, Inc., 1976)

[21]Dan G. Drew, "Roles and Decision Making of Three Television Beat Reporters," Journal of Broadcasting, Vol. XVI, No. 2 (Spring 1972).

[22]Stuart Hall, "The Rediscovery of 'Ideology': Return of the Repressed in Media Studies," in Culture, Society and the Media, eds. Michael Gurevitch, Tony Bennett, James Curran and Janet Woollacott (London and New York: Methuen, 1982), p. 69.

[23]T.J. Jackson Lears, "The Concept of Cultural Hegemony: Problems and Possibilities," American Historical Review, vol. 90 (June 1985), pp. 577.

[24]Hall, p. 70.

[25]Jay G. Blumler and Michael Gurevitch, "The Political Effects of Mass Communication," in Gurevitch et al., p. 262. See also Michael Gurevitch and Jay G. Blumler, "The Construction of Election News: An Observation Study at the BBC," in Individuals in Mass Media Organizations, eds. James S. Ettema and D. Charles Whitney (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1982) pp. 179-204.

[26]Michael Schudson, Discovering the News (New York: Basic Books, 1978), pp. 160-194.

[27]Brown et al., p. 15.

[28]David H. Weaver, personal letter to author, December 12, 1985.

TABLE 1

PERCENT OF SOURCE AFFILIATIONS BY STORY ORIGIN
LOCAL TELEVISION NEWS VERSUS
LOCAL NEWSPAPER STAFF

Source Affiliation	Local Television	Local* Newspapers
U.S. Government	7.7%	15.9%
State Government	14.8	14.9
Local Government	26.8	17.2
Foreign Government	0.0	0.4
Affiliated U.S. Citizen	28.2	36.0
Unaffiliated U.S. Citizen	14.1	6.0
Foreign Citizen	0.0	0.4
Other	8.5	9.3
Total %	100.1%	100.1%
N (Sources)	142	804

*From Brown et al.

TABLE 2

PERCENT OF SOURCE AFFILIATION BY STORY ORIGIN
NETWORK TELEVISION NEWS VERSUS
NATIONAL NEWSPAPER STAFF

Source Affiliation	Network Television	National* Newspapers
U.S. Government	32.5%	32.3%
State Government	2.6	5.4
Local Government	2.1	5.9
Foreign Government	11.4	11.1
Affiliated U.S. Citizen	32.9	25.1
Unaffiliated U.S. Citizen	8.1	4.3
Foreign Citizen	1.7	4.2
Other	8.5	11.8
Total %	99.8%	100.1%
N (Sources)	234	2363

*From Brown et al.

TABLE 3

PERCENT OF ROUTINE NEWS STORIES
TELEVISION VERSUS NEWSPAPERS

	Local	National	N (local/national)
Television	75%	71%	(76/80)
Newspapers	39	56	(142/312)

TABLE 4

PERCENT OF SOURCES BY STATUS
AND STORY ORIGIN

Source Status	Local News	Network News	Total
Executive	38.7	41.9	40.8
Spokesperson	4.9	4.7	4.6
Worker	6.3	7.3	6.9
Position not specified	23.9	26.5	26.2
Other	26.1	19.7	21.5
Total %	99.9	100.1	100.0
N	142	234	376

Chi-Square = 2.44 d.f. = 4 p = .65
Cramer's V = .08

TABLE 5

PERCENT OF STORY TOPICS BY STORY ORIGIN[a]

News Story Topic	Local Television	National Television	All Stories
Politics	6.3%	47.3%	28.2
Government	33.3	9.1	20.4
Crime	29.2	14.5	21.4
Disaster	16.7	12.7	14.6
Health	14.6	16.4	15.5
Total %	100.1%	100.0%	100.1%
N (Stories)	48	55	103

Chi-Square = 25.599 df = 4 p < .0001
Cramer's V = .499

(a) Some story topics were eliminated from this analysis in order to eliminate cells with low counts. They include military, labor, economy, business, morals, welfare, education, arts, science, energy and miscellaneous. Statistics are calculated only from topics appearing in the table.

TABLE 6

PERCENT OF CONFLICT STORIES BY STORY ORIGIN

Conflict Based	Local News	Network News	Total
Yes	32.9%	56.3%	44.9%
No	67.1	43.8	55.1
Total %	100.0	100.1	100.0
N	76	80	156
Chi-Square = 7.68	d.f. = 1	p = .006	
Phi = .235			

TABLE 7

PERCENT OF SOURCES BY GENDER AND STORY ORIGIN

Gender	Local News	Network News	Total
Male	46.5%	56.0%	52.3%
Female	11.3	5.6	7.7
Unidentified	42.3	38.5	40.0
Total %	100.1	100.1	100.0
N	142	234	376
Chi-Square = 5.83	d.f. = 2	p = .05	
Cramer's V = .125			

TABLE 8

PERCENT OF VEILED NEWS SOURCES TELEVISION VERSUS NEWSPAPERS

	Local	National	N (local/national)
Television	43.7%	50.0	(142/234)
Newspapers	38.7	51.2	(804/2363)

TABLE 9

NUMBER OF NEWS SOURCES USED PER STORY TELEVISION VERSUS NEWSPAPERS

	Television		Newspapers	
	Local	Network	Local	National
Mean	1.87	2.93	5.6	7.6
Maximum	7	13	16	26